

ORIGINAL

RE MAX

Above
the
Crowd!

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JUL 10 2000

FCC MAIL ROOM



Peggy Arvanitas

RE: EX PARTE PRESENTATION FCC DOCKET 99-200
IN THE MATTER OF NUMBERING RESOURCE OPTIMIZATION

Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communication's Commissions
445 12th Street SW
Washington DC 20554

Dear Ms. Salas,

Please accept my ex parte filing on behalf of Peggy Arvanitas,
representing myself. An original and two (2) copies are included
for filing. Please find a copy of this, stamp received, and
send it back to me.

Sincerely,

Peggy Arvanitas
Peggy Arvanitas

No. of Copies rec'd 0 + 2
List A B C D E

First Class
620 Bypass Drive
Clearwater, Florida 33764
Office: (727) 797-7500
E-Mail: pegremax2000@yahoo.com

Each Office Independently Owned and Operated

RE MAX

*Above
the
Crowd!*

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JUL 10 2000

FCC MAIL ROOM



Peggy Arvanitas

July 6, 2000

Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington DC 20554

RE: EX PARTE CONVERSATION WITH YOG VARMA, DEPUTY CHIEF
COMMON CARRIER BUREAU, ON DOCKET FCC 99-200

DEAR Ms. Salas,

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b)(2) of the FCC rules, I, Peggy Arvanitas submit for filing this notice of the ex parte communication with Yog Varma on June 15, 2000. The details of the meeting and the summary are listed below.

The initial concern was the June 2, 2000 ex parte filing of California Public Service Commission senior staff counsel, Helen Mickiewicz. Her concern was that, in the 310 area code that they had ordered the LEC's to do number pooling could not occur as scheduled. The reason being, one of the LEC's was NOT LNP CAPABLE. And, in her own words, "could not engage in number pooling." She asked the FCC to "allow state commissions to make a bonified request of those wireline carriers to have them implement LNP so that those carriers can begin number pooling."

I told Yog Varma, if that 310 area code is Los Angeles, it is already in the top 100 MSA's and therefore, those carriers that are not LNP capable are in violation of FCC 95-116 third order, May 1998. That filing gave specific deployment dates. Top 5 cities, (Los Angeles being one of them) should have been LNP capable as of May 1998. Other top 100 MSA's needed to be LNP (local number portability) capable by December 30, 1998. And outside of the top 100 MSA's that did not require LNP capability, only when a CLEC asked, and then there was a 4-6 month time frame.

First Class

620 Bypass Drive
Clearwater, Florida 33764
Office: (727) 797-7500
E-Mail: pegremax2000@yahoo.com

Each Office Independently Owned and Operated

I told Yog Varma that we had this similar problem with understanding deployment dates from my Florida PSC docket 981444TP. I had a very heated argument with two BellSouth employees, Stan Greer and Doug McCullough on our docket in Feb. 2000. It was a very racy screaming match with them saying they "needed to know what areas Florida PSC would want them to do number pooling in, to make sure we are LNP capable." Of course, on that Florida teleconference call, I chimed in that they had better be LNP capable in Dade/Miami/ Broward/ Jacksonville area. Not only were they top 100 MSA areas, but these were areas where Bellsouth was, since July 1999, charging for "portability" on end user phone bills. This was a federal tariff they filed, and if Bellsouth was not LNP capable in Florida, then they should have asked for a variance for Florida and not charged \$10-\$20 million minimum that year, in 3 top Florida MSA's. Finally, I told Yog Varma, the argument ended when Stan Greer, Bellsouth, at the next tele-conference call, started reciting from the 95-116 FIRST ORDER. I asked what year, and he said "1997". And I said, "well, I have third order, May 1998." At which point the Bellsouth representatives were MUTE the rest of the meeting. Office of Public Counsel, Charlie Beck, and Levent Ileri, PSC of Florida were witnesses to that meeting.

My concern to Yog Varma is the ignorance of even major telecom companies, and no check and balance, only a carrier's certification for federal tariffs. I said, I had talked to 3-4 CLEC's smaller companies in Florida, and both GTE and Bellsouth area CLEC's were saying, in top 100 MSA cities in Florida, that the ILEC's were either taking 4-6 months, or REFUSING TO PORT AT ALL BY SAYING THAT THEIR RATE CENTERS WERE OUTSIDE OF THE COUNTY AND THE CUSTOMERS WOULD NEED NEW NUMBERS.

Yog was concerned, and said it was up to the CLEC's to know the rules for portability. I said that if the ILEC's were still reading old orders, and the CLEC's being small and not having the money for a \$50,000 plus FCC/ PSC of Florida attorney to continually keep up on new FCC orders, who's to blame? I told Yog Varma that it was HIS job, as Common Carrier Bureau deputy chief, to be the referee and make sure all the players are playing by the rules. The customers don't even know the rules for portability. He said they could do a complaint, and I reminded him INC Number portability guidelines say complaints go to the NANC, and they NANC maybe would file it 60 days later with the CCB. The INC/ NANC rules are sometimes in violation of procedures issued by the FCC. Then Yog said those infamous words..... in the top 100 MSA's.....

Yog Varma: Well, if a CLEC makes a written demand to an ILEC to port numbers, then as per the INC guidelines, the ILEC has 72 HOURS TO PORT THE NUMBERS TO THE CLEC. And I said, some of the CLEC's were told, as per the ILEC or the NANC, that only so many numbers can get ported per carrier, per NPA. I did not know if it was because of the LERG or whatever. Then I said to Yog Varma, well the LERG has a port column, and the CLEC's get the subscription from Telecordia to know how long they should wait to get a business ported number. If the column has Y, then it should be less than a month, but if it had N for no, then it could take 4-6 months. Regardless of the fact that that NPA was in the top 100 MSA's and they should be LNP capable. Then YOG said,

YOG: well, I had been told that the LERG was sometimes outdated information and could not be reliable.

Then I said, well, they don't say that when they sell the subscription service to the ILEC's and CLEC's. I had filed FCC 98-184 Feb 14, 2000, challenging GTE /Bell Atlantic's merger on the grounds they were not LNP capable in Sarasota. Bradenton areas, as of Dec 1999, and that was a top 100 MSA. And they just denied it like the info in the LERG did not exist.

I did come to the conclusion that small CLEC's are getting shafted, even though they have fiber optic/ new wiring. The Tampa Bay area ILEC has older copper wiring, and were slow to deploy upgrades because of their Local 824 Union negotiations, and them shutting maintenance down 50% while they were out of contract. I hope that the FCC takes a more active role in ENFORCEMENT so that the small guy can make money.

I did thank Yog Varma for what was a very racy 22 minutes of conversation, even though I felt he should be a "bigger brother" to the CLEC's. And, I also apologized for calling him "Yogi" three times.

Thank-you for making this a part of my record. I am sorry that the Records and Reporting could not find my filing I mailed in from last month, but this time I will be sending it Airborne.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Peggy Arvanitas". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Peggy Arvanitas
"representing myself"